arXiv:1209.6022v1 [math.PR] 26 Sep 2012

Large deviations in the reinforced random walk model on trees

Yu Zhang
Department of Mathematics, University of Colorado

September 27, 2012

Abstract

In this paper, we consider the linearly reinforced and the once-reinforced random walk models in the transient phase on trees. We show the large deviations for the upper tails for both models. We also show the exponential decay for the lower tail in the once-reinforced random walk model. On the other hand, the lower tail is in polynomial decay for the linearly reinforced random walk model.

1 Introduction.

Let $\mathbf{T}$ be an infinite tree with vertex set $\mathbf{V}$. Each $v \in \mathbf{V}$ has $b+1$ neighbors except a vertex, called the *root*, which has b neighbors for $b \geq 2$. We denote the root by $\mathbf{0}$. For any two vertices $u, v \in \mathbf{V}$, let $e = [u, v]$ be its edge with vertices u and v. We denote by $\mathbf{E}$ the edge set. Consider a Markov chain $\mathbf{X} = \{X_i, \omega(e, i)\}$, which starts at $X_0 = \mathbf{0}$ with $\omega(e, 0) = 1$ for all $e \in \mathbf{E}$, where $\omega(e, 0)$ is called the *initial weight*. For $i \geq 1$ and $e \in \mathbf{E}$, let $X_i \in \mathbf{V}$ and let $\omega(e, i) \geq 1$ be the i-th *weight*. The transition from X_i to the nearest neighbor X_{i+1} is randomly selected with probabilities proportional to weights $\omega(e, i)$ of incident edges e to X_i. After X_i has changed to X_{i+1}, the weights are updated by the following rule:

$$w(e, i+1) = \begin{cases} 1 + k(c-1) & \text{for } [X_i, X_{i+1}] = e \text{ and } e \text{ had been traversed } k \text{ times,} \\ w(e, i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for fixed $c > 1$. With this weight change, the model is called a *linearly reinforced random walk*. Note that if $c = 1$, then it is a simple random walk.

The linearly reinforced random walk model was first studied by Coppersmith and Diaconis (unpublished manuscript (1987)) on the $\mathbf{Z}^d$ lattice. The main question of whether the walks are recurrent or transient still remains open for $d \geq 2$. Pemantle (1988) studied this model on trees and showed that there exists $c_0 = c_0(b) \geq 4.29$ such that when $1 < c < c_0$, then the walk is transient and when $c > c_0$, then the walk is recurrent. Furthermore, Collevecchio (2006) and Aidekon (2008) investigated the behavior of $h(X_n)$ on the transient phase, where

---

AMS classification: 60K37 60J15.
Key words and phrases: reinforced random walks on trees, large deviation.

$h(x)$ is denoted by the number of edges from the root to x for $x \in \mathbf{T}$. They focused on $c = 2$ and showed that the law of large numbers holds for $h(X_n)$ with a positive speed. More precisely, if $c = 2$, then there exists $0 < T = T(b) < b/(b+2)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{h(X_n)}{n} = T. \tag{1.1}$$

By the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}\frac{h(X_n)}{n} = T. \tag{1.2}$$

By a simple computation, the probability that the walks repeatedly move between an edge connected to the root is larger thann^{-C} for some $C = C(b) > 0$. Therefore,

$$n^{-C} \leq \mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \leq 1), \tag{1.3}$$

so the lower tail of $h(X_n)$ has the following behavior:

$$n^{-C} \leq \mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \leq n(T-\epsilon)) \tag{1.4}$$

for all $\epsilon < T$ and for all large n. In this paper, C and C_i are positive constants depending on c, b, ϵ, N, M, and δ, but not on n, m, and k. They also change from appearance to appearance. From (1.4), unlike a simple random walk on a tree, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{-1}{n^{\eta}} \log \mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \leq n(T-\epsilon)) = 0 \tag{1.5}$$

for all $\epsilon < T$ and for all $\eta > 0$.

We may ask what the behavior of the upper tail is. Unlike the lower tail, we show that the upper tail has a standard large deviation behavior for large b.

Theorem 1. *For the linearly reinforced random walk model with* $c = 2$ *and* $b \geq 70$, *and for* $\epsilon > 0$, *there exists* $0 < \alpha = \alpha(b, \epsilon)$ *such that*

$$\lim \frac{-1}{n} \log \mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq (T+\epsilon)n) = \alpha.$$

Remark 1. Collevecchio (2006) introduced the cut time τ (see the definition in section 2). He showed that (see Lemma 2.1 as follows) if $b \geq 70$, then

$$\mathbf{E}\tau < \infty. \tag{1.6}$$

Here we need (1.6) to show Theorem 1. So we need the restriction that $b \geq 70$. We conjecture that (1.6) holds for all $b \geq 2$. Note that if (1.6) indeed holds for all $b \geq 2$, then we can release the condition that $b \geq 70$ in Theorem 1.

Durrett, Kesten, and Limic (2002) also investigated a similar reinforced random walk $\{Y_k\}$, except that the weight changes by

$$w(e, i+1) = \begin{cases} c & \text{for } [Y_i, Y_{i+1}] = e\} \\ w(e, i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for fixed $c > 1$. This random walk model is called a *once-reinforced random walk.* For the once-reinforced random walk model, Durrett, Kesten, and Limic (2002) showed that for any $c > 1$, the walks are always transient. In addition, they also showed the law of large numbers for $h(Y_n)$. More precisely, they showed that there exists $0 < S = S(c) < b/(b+c)$ such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{h(Y_n)}{n} = S. \tag{1.7}$$

We also investigate the large deviations for $h(Y_n)$. We have the following theorem, similar to the linearly reinforced random walk model.

Theorem 2. *For the once-reinforced random walk model with* $c > 1$ *and for* $\epsilon > 0$*, there exists* $\beta = \beta(c, b, \epsilon) > 0$ *such that*

$$\lim \frac{-1}{n} \log \mathbf{P}(h(Y_n) \geq (S + \epsilon)n) = \beta.$$

Remark 2. It is difficult to compute the precise rate functions α and β. But we may obtain some properties such as the continuity in ϵ for them.

We may ask what the lower tail deviation for $h(Y_n)$ is. Unlike in the linearly reinforced random walk model, the lower tail is still exponentially decaying.

Theorem 3. *For the once-reinforced random walk model with* $c > 1$ *and* $0 < \epsilon < S$*,*

$$0 < \liminf \frac{-1}{n} \log \mathbf{P}(h(Y_n) \leq (S - \epsilon)n) \leq \limsup \frac{-1}{n} \log \mathbf{P}(h(Y_n) \leq (S - \epsilon)n) < \infty.$$

Remark 3. Durrett, Kesten, and Limic (2002) also showed that (1.5) holds for a finitely many times reinforced random walk. We can also adopt the same proof of Theorems 2 and 3 to show that the same arguments hold for a finitely many times reinforced random walk.

Remark 4. We believe that the limit exists in Theorem 3, but we are unable to show it.

2 Preliminaries.

In this section, we focus on the linearly reinforced random walk model with $c = 2$. We define a *hitting time* sequence $\{t_i\}$ as follows. Let $t_0 = 0$ and t_{k-1} be defined. Then

$$t_k = \min\{j > t_{k-1} : h(X_j) = k\}.$$

Note that $T > 0$, so $h(X_j) \to \infty$ as $j \to \infty$. Thus, t_k is finite and

$$0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_k < \cdots < \infty. \tag{2.1}$$

With this definition, for each $k \geq 1$,

$$h(X_{t_k}) - h(X_{t_{k-1}}) = 1. \tag{2.2}$$

We also define a *leaving time* sequence $\{\rho_i\}$ as follows. If $\rho_0 = 0$ and ρ_{i-1} is defined, then

$$\rho_i = \max\{j > \rho_{i-1} : h(X_j) \geq i\}.$$

Since the walk $\mathbf{X}$ is transient and is in $\mathbf{T}$,

$$0 = \rho_0 < \rho_1 < \cdots < \rho_k < \cdots < \infty. \tag{2.3}$$

However, unlike the random walk model, $\{t_j - t_{j-1}\}$ are not independent increments. So we need to look for independence from these times. To achieve this target, we call t_i a *cut time* if

$$\rho_i - t_i = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

We select these cut times and list all of them in increasing order as

$$0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \cdots < \tau_k < \cdots. \tag{2.5}$$

Note that it is possible that, for k,

$$\rho_i - t_i > 0 \text{ for } i \geq k.$$

In this case, we simply denote by $\tau_k = \infty$. However, we will show in the following lemma that $\tau_k < \infty$ almost surely for all k. By this definition, it can be shown easily (see page 97 in Collevecchio (2006)) that

$$\left(\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k, h(X_{\tau_{k+1}}) - h(X_{\tau_k})\right) \text{ is an i.i.d. sequence.} \tag{2.6}$$

Level $k \geq 1$ is the set of vertices v such that $h(v) = k$. Level k is a *cut* level if the walk visits it only once. We also call X_k, the only visiting vertex, the *cut vertex.* It follows from the cut time definition that X_{τ_k} is a cut vertex. Define l_1 to be the first cut level with the minimum distance from the root. Suppose that l_{i-1} is defined for $i > 1$. Let

$$l_i := \min\{j > l_{i-1} : j \text{ is a cut level}\}. \tag{2.7}$$

With this definition, Collevecchio (2006) proved the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *For* $c = 2$ *and* $b \geq 70$,

$$\mathbf{P}(l_1 \geq k) \leq 0.115^k. \tag{2.8}$$

Furthermore, for $p_0 = 1002/1001$,

$$\mathbf{E}\tau_1^{p_0} < \infty. \tag{2.9}$$

With Lemma 2.1, we can see that $h(\tau_{k+1}) - h(\tau_k)$ is large with a small probability. Also, $\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k$ is large with a small probability. However, to show a large deviation result, we need a much shorter tail requirement. Therefore, we need to truncate both $h(\tau_{k+1}) - h(\tau_k)$ and $\tau_{k+1} - \tau_k$. We call τ_k N-*short* for $k \geq 1$ if

$$h(X_{\tau_k}) - h(X_{\tau_{k-1}}) \leq N; \tag{2.10}$$

otherwise, we call it N-*long*. We list all N-short times as

$$0 = \tau_0(N) < \tau_1(N) < \cdots. \tag{2.11}$$

If $h(X_{\tau_i}) - h(X_{\tau_{i-1}}) > N$ for all $i \geq k$, we simply denote it by $\tau_k(N) = \infty$. Suppose that $\tau_k(N) < \infty$. We know that $\tau_k(N) = \tau_i$ for some i. We denote it by $\tau'_k(N) = \tau_{i-1}$. For $N > 0$, let

$$I_n = \max\{i : \tau_i(N) \leq n\}$$

and

$$h_n(N) = \sum_{i=1}^{I_n} \left(h\left(X_{\tau_i(N)}\right) - h\left(X_{\tau'_i(N)}\right)\right). \tag{2.12}$$

If $\tau_k(N) \leq n \leq \tau_{k+1}(N)$, then

$$h_n(N) \leq h\left(X_{\tau_k(N)}\right) \leq h(X_n) \leq h\left(X_{\tau_{k+1}(N)}\right). \tag{2.13}$$

Now we show that $h_n(N)/n$ and $h(X_n)/n$ are not very different.

Lemma 2.2. *For* $\epsilon > 0$, $c = 2$, *and* $b \geq 70$, *there exist* $N = N(\epsilon)$ *and* $C_i = C_i(\epsilon, N)$ *for* $i = 1, 2$ *such that*

$$\mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq h_n(N) + n\epsilon) \leq C_1 \exp(-C_2 n). \tag{2.14}$$

Proof. If

$$h(X_n) - h_n(N) \geq \epsilon n, \tag{2.15}$$

we may suppose that there are k many N-long cut time pairs such that

$$\tau'_{i_1} < \tau_{i_1} < \tau'_{i_2} < \tau_{i_2} < \cdots < \tau'_{i_j} < \tau_{i_j} \cdots \tau'_{i_k} < \tau_{i_k} \leq n \leq \tau_{i_k+1}$$

with either

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} h(X_{\tau_{i_j}}) - h(X_{\tau'_{i_j}}) \geq \epsilon n/2 \tag{2.16}$$

where

$$h(X_{\tau_{i_j}}) - h(X_{\tau'_{i_j}}) > N \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \cdots, k \leq n/N, \tag{2.17}$$

or

$$h(X_{\tau_{i_k+1}}) - h(X_{\tau_{i_k}}) > \epsilon n/2. \tag{2.18}$$

For the second case, by (2.8) in Lemma 2.1, there exist $C_i = C_i(\epsilon)$ for $i = 3, 4$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}\left(h(X_n) \geq h_n(N) + n\epsilon, h(X_{\tau_{i_{k+1}}}) - h(X_{\tau_{i_k}}) > \epsilon n/2\right) \leq C_3 n \exp(-C_4 n). \tag{2.19}$$

Now we focus on the first case, with (2.16) and (2.17). For any fixed paired sequence

$$0 \leq p'_1 < p_1 < \cdots < p'_j < p_j < \cdots < p'_k < p_k \leq n, \tag{2.20}$$

it costs $\binom{n}{2k}$ to fix the N-long cut time pairs $\tau_{i_j} = p_j$ and $\tau'_{i_j} = p'_j$, with

$$h(X_{p_j}) - h(X_{p'_j}) > N$$

for $j = 1, \cdots, k$. For any fixed paired sequence

$$0 < l'_1 < l_1 < \cdots < l'_k < l_j < \cdots < l'_k < l_k \leq n, \text{ with } l_j - l'_j > N \tag{2.21}$$

for $j = 1, \cdots, k$, it also costs at most $\binom{n}{2k}$ to fix the levels $h(X_{\tau_{i_j}}) = l_j$ and $h(X_{\tau'_{i_j}}) = l'_j$. Thus, if (2.16) holds, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} (l_j - l'_j) \geq \epsilon n/2. \tag{2.22}$$

Let $\mathbf{L} = \{v \in \mathbf{V} : h(v) = l'_k\}$, and let $\{X_n^{p'_k}(x)\}$ be the linearly reinforced walks starting from $x \in \mathbf{L}$ at time p'_j in a subtree $\{v \in \mathbf{T} : h(v) \geq h(x)\}$. We also define $l_1(x, p'_k)$ to be the first cut level starting from x at time p'_k for walks $\{X_n^{p'_k}(x)\}$, similar to the definition in (2.7), where the walks are $\{X_n\}$. With these observations, there are two fixed sequences in (2.20) and (2.21) such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}\left(h(X_n) \geq h_n(N) + n\epsilon, (2.16) \text{ and } (2.17) \text{ hold}\right) \\
\leq\ & \sum_{k=1}^{n/N} \binom{n}{2k}^2 \mathbf{P}\left(h(X_n) \geq h_n(N) + n\epsilon, \tau_{i_j} = p_j, \tau'_{i_j} = p'_j, h(X_{p_j}) = l_j, h(X_{p'_j}) = l'_j, j = 1, \cdots, k\right) \\
=\ & \sum_{k=1}^{n/N} \binom{n}{2k}^2 \sum_{x \in \mathbf{L}} \mathbf{P}(\tau_{i_j} = p_j, \tau'_{i_j} = p'_j, h(X_{p_j}) = l_j, h(X_{p'_j}) = l'_j, \\
&\qquad\qquad j = 1, \cdots, k-1, \tau'_{i_k} = p'_k, X_{p'_k} = x, \tau_{i_k} = p_k, h(X_{p_k}) = l_k)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n/N} \binom{n}{2k}^2 \sum_{x\in \mathbf{L}} \mathbf{P}(\tau_{i_j} = p_j, \tau'_{i_j} = p'_j, h(X_{p_j}) = l_j, h(X_{p'_j}) = l'_j,$$
$$j = 1, \cdots, k-1, \tau'_{i_k} = p'_k, X_{p'_k} = x, l_1(x, p'_k) \geq l_k - l'_k).$$

By (2.6) and the definition of $X_n^{p'_k}(x)$,

$$\left\{\tau_{i_j} = p_j, \tau_{i'_j} = p'_j, h(X_{p_j}) = l_j, h(X_{p'_j}) = l'_j, j = 1, \cdots, k-1, X_{p'_k} = x\right\} \text{ and } \{l_1(x, p'_k) \geq l_k - l'_k\}$$

are independent. By translation invariance, l_1 and $l_1(x, p'_k)$ have the same distribution. So by Lemma 2.1,

$$\mathbf{P}\left(h(X_n) \geq h_n(N) + n\epsilon, \text{(2.16) and (2.17) hold}\right)$$
$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n/N} \binom{n}{2k}^2 \sum_{x\in \mathbf{L}} \mathbf{P}(\tau_{i_j} = p_j, \tau'_{i_j} = p'_j, h(X_{p_j}) = l_j, h(X_{p'_j}) = l'_j,$$
$$j = 1, \cdots, k-1, \tau'_{i_k} = p'_k, X_{p'_k} = x)\mathbf{P}(l_1 \geq l_k - l'_k)$$
$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n/N} \binom{n}{2k}^2 \sum_{x\in \mathbf{L}} \mathbf{P}(\tau_{i_j} = p_j, \tau'_{i_j} = p'_j, h(X_{p_j}) = l_j, h(X_{p'_j}) = l'_j,$$
$$j = 1, \cdots, k-1, \tau'_{i_k} = p'_k, X_{p'_k} = x) 0.115^{l_k - l'_k}$$
$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n/N} \binom{n}{2k}^2 \mathbf{P}\left(\tau_{i_j} = p_j, \tau'_{i_j} = p'_j, h(X_{p_j}) = l_j, j = 1, \cdots, k-1\right) 0.115^{l_k - l'_k}. \tag{2.23}$$

By (2.22), we iterate (2.23) to have

$$\mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq h_n(N) + n\epsilon, \text{(2.16) and (2.17) hold}) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{n/N} \binom{n}{2k}^2 0.115^{\epsilon n/2}. \tag{2.24}$$

By a standard entropy bound, as given in Corollary 2.6.2 of Engel (1997), for $k \leq n/N$,

$$\binom{n}{2k}^2 \leq \exp(2n \log N/N). \tag{2.25}$$

By (2.25), if we take N large in (2.24), then there exist $C_i = C_i(\epsilon, N)$ for $i = 4, 5$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}\left(h_n(X_n) \geq h_n(N) + n\epsilon, \text{(2.16) and (2.17) hold}\right) \leq C_4 n \exp(-C_5 n). \tag{2.26}$$

So Lemma 2.2 holds by (2.19) and (2.26). □

Let $\mathcal{E}_n(\epsilon)$ be the event that $h(X_n) \geq n(T - \epsilon)$. From Lemma 2.2, if $\epsilon < T/2$, there exist $N_0 = N_0(\epsilon)$ and $M_0 = M_0(\epsilon)$ such that for all $N > N_0$ and $M > M_0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{P}(h_n(N) \leq nT/2, \mathcal{E}_n(\epsilon)) = 0. \tag{2.27}$$

By (2.27), if $N > N_0$ and $M > M_0$, then we can see that for each k,

$$\tau_k(N) < \infty.$$

In fact, we suppose that $\tau_k(N) = \infty$ for some k with a positive probability. Note that by (1.5), $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{E}_n(\epsilon))$ converges to one as $n \to \infty$. Note also that, by (2.27), there are $Tn/2N$ many $\tau_i(N)$s such that

$$\tau_i(N) \leq n$$

with a probability near one as n becomes large. If n is large, this will be contrary to the assumption that $\tau_k(N) = \infty$ for some k with a positive probability. So we know that for all large $N = N(b)$,

$$0 = \tau_0(N) < \tau_1(N) < \tau_2(N) < \cdots < \tau_k(N) < \cdots < \infty. \tag{2.28}$$

By the definition of $\tau_k(N)$ and by (2.28),

$$\tau_k(N) - \tau_k'(N) = \tau_i - \tau_{i-1}$$

for some i. So by (2.6),

$$\left\{\left(\tau_k(N) - \tau_k'(N), h\left(X_{\tau_k(N)}\right) - h\left(X_{\tau_k'(N)}\right)\right)\right\} \text{ is an i.i.d sequence.} \tag{2.29}$$

Note that $\tau_k \leq \tau_k(N)$, so we have

$$0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \cdots < \tau_k < \cdots < \infty. \tag{2.30}$$

We also need to control the time difference such that $\tau_k(N) - \tau_k'(N)$ cannot be large. We call $\tau_k(N)$ *M-tight* for $k \geq 1$ if

$$\tau_k(N) - \tau_{k-1}'(N) \leq M. \tag{2.31}$$

We list all M-tight N-short cut times as

$$\tau_1(N,M), \tau_2(N,M), \cdots \tau_k(N,M), \cdots.$$

Suppose that $\tau_k(N,M) < \infty$. We know that $\tau_k(N,M) = \tau_i$ for some i. We denote $\tau_k'(N,M) = \tau_{i-1}$. Let

$$J_n = \max\{i : \tau_i(N,M) \leq n\}$$

and

$$h_n(N,M) = \sum_{i=1}^{J_n} \left(h\left(X_{\tau_i(N,M)}\right) - h\left(X_{\tau_i'(N,M)}\right)\right). \tag{2.32}$$

It follows from the definition in (2.32) that

$$h_n(N, M) \leq h_n(N) \leq h(X_n). \tag{2.33}$$

The following lemma shows that $h_n(N, M)/n$ and $h_n(N)/n$ are not far away.

Lemma 2.3. *For $\epsilon > 0$, for N, and for each n, there exists $M = M(\epsilon, N)$ such that*

$$h_n(N) \leq h_n(N, M) + n\epsilon.$$

Proof. If $h_n(N) > h_n(N, M) + n\epsilon$, we know that there are at least $\epsilon n/2N$ many $\{\tau_i(N)\}$ such that

$$\tau_i(N) - \tau_i'(N) > M. \tag{2.34}$$

If we take $M \geq 3N\epsilon^{-1}$, then

$$n \geq \sum_{i=1}^{I_n} (\tau_i(N) - \tau_{i-1}(N)) > M\epsilon n/2N > n. \tag{2.35}$$

The contradiction shows that

$$h_n(N) \leq h_n(N, M) + n\epsilon.$$

So Lemma 2.3 follows. □

By Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{P}(h_n(N, M) \leq Tn/2, \mathcal{E}_n(\epsilon)) = 0.$$

Note that $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{E}_n(\epsilon))$ is near one for large n, so there are at least $Tn/2M$ many $\tau_i(N, M)$s with $\tau_i(N, M) \leq n$ that also have a probability near one for large n. Hence, $\tau_k(N, M) = \infty$ cannot have a positive probability for each k. Therefore,

$$\tau_1(N, M) < \tau_2(N, M) < \cdots \tau_k(N, M) < \cdots < \infty. \tag{2.36}$$

By (2.36), we know that $\tau_k(N, M) = \tau_i$ for some i and

$$\tau_k(N, M) - \tau_k'(N, M) = \tau_i - \tau_{i-1}.$$

Therefore, by (2.6),

$$\left\{\left(\tau_k(N, M) - \tau_k'(N, M), h\left(X_{\tau_k(N,M)}\right) - h\left(X_{\tau_k'(N,M)}\right)\right)\right\} \text{ is an i.i.d sequence.} \tag{2.37}$$

3 Large deviations for $h_n(N, M)$.

Now we state standard tail estimates for an i.i.d. sequence. The proof can be followed directly from Markov's inequality.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $Z_1, \cdots Z_k, \cdots$, be an i.i.d. sequence with $\mathbf{E}\exp(\theta Z_1) < \infty$ for some $\theta > 0$, and let*

$$S_n = Z_1 + Z_2 + \cdots + Z_n.$$

For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $C_i = C_i(\epsilon)$ for $i = 1, 2$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}(S_n \geq n(\mathbf{E}Z_1 + \epsilon)) \leq C_1 \exp(-C_2 n),$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}(S_n \leq n(\mathbf{E}Z_1 - \epsilon)) \leq C_1 \exp(-C_2 n).$$

Let

$$\mathbf{E}(\tau_1) = A \geq 1 \text{ and } \mathbf{E}\left(\tau_1(N, M) - \tau_1'(N, M)\right) = A(N, M)$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}h\left(X_{\tau_1}\right) = B \geq 1 \text{ and } \mathbf{E}\left(h\left(X_{\tau_1(N,M)}\right) - h\left(X_{\tau_1'(N,M)}\right)\right) = B(N, M).$$

We set

$$T_n = \tau_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n}(\tau_k - \tau_{k-1}) \text{ and } T_n(N, M) = \sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(\tau_k(N, M) - \tau_k'(N, M)\right)$$

and

$$H_n = h\left(X_{\tau_n}\right) = \sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(h\left(X_{\tau_k}\right) - h\left(X_{\tau_{k-1}}\right)\right) \text{ and } H_n(N, M) = \sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(h\left(X_{\tau_k(N,M)}\right) - h\left(X_{\tau_k'(N,M)}\right)\right).$$

By the law of large numbers,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{T_n}{n} = A \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{T_n(N, M)}{n} = A(N, M) \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{H_n}{n} = B \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{H_n(N, M)}{n} = B(N, M). \tag{3.2}$$

If $\tau_i \leq n \leq \tau_{i+1}$, then

$$h(X_{\tau_i}) \leq X_n \leq h(X_{\tau_{i+1}}). \tag{3.3}$$

Thus,

$$\frac{h(X_{\tau_i})}{\tau_{i+1}} \leq \frac{h(X_n)}{n} \leq \frac{h(X_{\tau_{i+1}})}{\tau_i}. \tag{3.4}$$

By (3.1) and (3.2),

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{h(X_{\tau_i})}{\tau_{i+1}} = \lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{h(X_{\tau_{i+1}})}{\tau_i} = \frac{B}{A}. \tag{3.5}$$

So by (1.1), (3.4), and (3.5),

$$\frac{B}{A} = T. \tag{3.6}$$

Regarding $B(N, M)$ and $A(N, M)$, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *For $c = 2$ and $b \geq 70$,*

$$\lim_{N,M\to\infty} A(N, M) = A \text{ and } \lim_{N,M\to\infty} B(N, M) = B \text{ and } \lim_{N,M\to\infty} \frac{B(N, M)}{A(N, M)} = T.$$

Proof. Note that

$$\lim_{N,M\to\infty} \tau_1(N, M) - \tau_1'(N, M) = \tau_1. \tag{3.7}$$

By the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{N,M\to\infty} A(N, M) = \lim_{N,M\to\infty} \mathbf{E}(\tau_1(N, M) - \tau_1'(N, M)) = \mathbf{E}\tau_1 = A. \tag{3.8}$$

Similarly,

$$\lim_{N,M\to\infty} B(N, M) = \lim_{N,M\to\infty} \mathbf{E}\left(h\left(X_{\tau_1(N,M)}\right) - h\left(X_{\tau_1'(N,M)}\right)\right) = B. \tag{3.9}$$

Therefore, Lemma 3.2 follows from (3.8), (3.9), and (3.6). □

Now we show that $h_n(N, M)$ has an exponential upper tail.

Lemma 3.3. *If $c = 2$ and $b \geq 70$, then for $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $N_0 = N_0(\epsilon)$ and $M_0 = M_0(\epsilon)$ such that for all $N \geq N_0$ and $M \geq M_0$*

$$\mathbf{P}(h_n(N, M) \geq n(T + \epsilon)) \leq C_1 \exp(-C_2 n), \tag{3.10}$$

where $C_i = C_i(\epsilon, N, M)$ for $i = 1, 2$ are constants.

Proof. Recall that

$$J_n = \max\{i : \tau_i(N, M) \leq n\}.$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{P}(h_n(N, M) \geq n(T + B\epsilon)) \\ = \ &\mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{J_n} \left(h\left(X_{\tau_i(N,M)}\right) - h\left(X_{\tau_i'(N,M)}\right)\right) \geq n(T + B\epsilon)\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{J_n}\left(h\left(X_{\tau_i(N,M)}\right)-h\left(X_{\tau_i'(N,M)}\right)\right)\geq n(T+B\epsilon), J_n\leq n\left(\frac{T}{B(N,M)}+\epsilon/2\right)\right)\\
&\quad +\mathbf{P}\left(J_n>n\left(\frac{T}{B(N,M)}+\epsilon/2\right)\right)\\
&\leq \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n(T/B(N,M)+\epsilon/2)}\left(h\left(X_{\tau_i(N,M)}\right)-h\left(X_{\tau_i'(N,M)}\right)\right)\geq n(T+B\epsilon)\right)\\
&\quad +\mathbf{P}\left(J_n>n\left(\frac{T}{B(N,M)}\right)+\epsilon/2)\right)\\
&= I+II. \qquad (3.11)
\end{aligned}$$

Here without loss of generality, we assume that $n(T/B(N,M)+\epsilon/2)$ is an integer, otherwise we can use $\lceil n(T/B(N,M))+\epsilon/2)\rceil$ to replace $n(T/B(N,M))+\epsilon/2)$. We will estimate I and II separately. For I, note that by Lemma 3.2, there exist $N_0=N_0(\epsilon)$ and $M_0=M_0(\epsilon)$ such that for all $N\geq N_0$ and $M\geq M_0$

$$\mathbf{E}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n(T/B(N,M)+\epsilon/2)}\left(h\left(X_{\tau_i(N,M)}\right)-h\left(X_{\tau_i'(N,M)}\right)\right)\right)\leq nT(1+B(N,M)\epsilon/2)\leq nT(1+2B\epsilon/3).$$

Note also that by (2.10) and (2.37),

$$\left\{h\left(X_{\tau_i(N,M)}\right)-h\left(X_{\tau_i'(N,M)}\right)\right\} \text{ is a uniformly bounded i.i.d. sequence,}$$

so by Lemma 3.1, there exist $C_i=C_i(\epsilon,N,M)$ for $i=3,4$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n(T/B(N,M)+\epsilon/2)}\left(h\left(X_{\tau_i(N,M)}\right)-h\left(X_{\tau_i'(N,M)}\right)\right)\geq n(T+B\epsilon)\right)\leq C_3\exp(-C_4n). \qquad (3.12)$$

Now we estimate II. By Lemma 3.2, there exist $N_0=N_0(\epsilon,b)$ and $M_0=M_0(\epsilon,b)$ such that for all $N\geq N_0$ and $M\geq M_0$

$$\mathbf{P}\left(J_n>n\left(\frac{T}{B(N,M)}\right)+\epsilon/2\right)=\mathbf{P}\left(J_n>n\left(A^{-1}(N,M)+\epsilon/3\right)\right). \qquad (3.13)$$

Note that

$$\left\{J_n\geq n(A^{-1}(N,M)+\epsilon/3)\right\}\subset\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n(A^{-1}(N,M)+\epsilon/3)}(\tau_i(N,M)-\tau_i'(N,M))\leq n\right\}. \qquad (3.14)$$

Note also that

$$\mathbf{E}\sum_{i=1}^{n(A^{-1}(N,M)+\epsilon/3)}(\tau_i(N,M)-\tau_i'(N,M))=n(1+\epsilon A(N,M)/3),$$

and, by (2.37), $\{\tau_i(N,M)-\tau_i'(N,M)\}$ is a uniformly bounded i.i.d. sequence, so by (3.13), and (3.14), and Lemma 3.1, there exist $C_i = C_i(\epsilon, b, N, M)$ for $i = 5, 6$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{P}\left(J_n > n\left(\frac{T}{B(N,M)} + \epsilon/2\right)\right) \\
\leq\ & \mathbf{P}\left(J_n > n(A^{-1}(N,M) + \epsilon/3)\right) \\
=\ & \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n(A^{-1}(N,M)+\epsilon/3)} (\tau_i(N,M) - \tau_i'(N,M)) \leq n\right) \\
\leq\ & C_5 \exp(-C_6 n). \qquad (3.15)
\end{aligned}$$

For all large N and M, we substitute (3.12) and (3.15) in (3.11) to have

$$\mathbf{P}(h_n(N,M) \geq n(T+\epsilon)) \leq I + II \leq C_7 \exp(-C_8 n) \qquad (3.16)$$

for $C_i = C_i(\epsilon, N, M)$ for $i = 7, 8$. Therefore, we have an exponential tail estimate for $h_n(N,M)$. So Lemma 3.3 follows. □

Let

$$L_n = \max\{i : \tau_i \leq n\}$$

and

$$h_n = \sum_{i=1}^{L_n} \left(h(X_{\tau_i}) - h(X_{\tau_{i-1}})\right).$$

By this definition,

$$h_n < \infty. \qquad (3.17)$$

We show the following subadditive argument for h_n.

Lemma 3.4. *For $c = 2$, $b \geq 70$, and for each pair of positive integers n and m,*

$$\mathbf{P}(h_n \geq nC)\mathbf{P}(h_m \geq mC) \leq n\mathbf{P}(h_{n+m} \geq (n+m)C),$$

for any $C > 0$.

Proof. By (2.28), there exists $k \geq 0$ such that

$$\tau_k \leq n \leq \tau_{k+1}.$$

So

$$h_n \leq h(X_{\tau_k}) \leq h(X_n) \leq h(X_{\tau_{k+1}}). \qquad (3.18)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}(h_n \geq nC) &\leq \sum_{i\leq n}\sum_x \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k}\left(h(X_{\tau_j}) - h(X_{\tau_{j-1}})\right) \geq nC, \tau_k = i, X_i = x\right) \\
&= \sum_{i\leq n}\sum_x \mathbf{P}\left(h(X_i) \geq nC, \tau_k = i, X_i = x\right) \qquad (3.19)
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\{X_n^i(x)\}$ be the linearly reinforced random walks starting from x at time i in a subtree $\{v \in \mathbf{T} : h(v) \geq h(x)\}$. We can define τ_k^i and $h_m^i(x)$ for $\{X_n^i(x)\}$ similar to the definitions of τ_k and h_m for $\{X_n\}$. Note that the event of

$$\{h(X_i) \geq nC, \tau_k = i, X_i = x\}$$

only depends on the configurations inside $\{y : h(y) \leq h(x)\}$ and the time interval $[0, i]$. Note also that $\{h_m^i(x) \geq mC\}$ only depends on the configurations inside $\{y : h(y) > h(x)\}$ and the time interval $[i, \infty)$. So the two events are independent. On the other hand, by translation invariance,

$$\mathbf{P}(h_m^i(x) \geq mC) = \mathbf{P}(h_m \geq mC). \tag{3.20}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}(h_n \geq nC)\mathbf{P}(h_m \geq mC) \\ \leq\ & \sum_{i \leq n} \sum_x \mathbf{P}\left(h(X_i) \geq nC, \tau_k = i, X_i = x\right) \mathbf{P}(h_m^i(x) \geq mC) \\ =\ & \sum_{i \leq n} \sum_x \mathbf{P}\left(h(X_i) \geq nC, \tau_k = i, X_i = x, h_m^i(x) \geq mC\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Note that $i \leq n$, so

$$h_m^i(x) \leq h_{m+n-i}^i(x). \tag{3.22}$$

By (3.21) and (3.22),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}(h_n \geq nC)\mathbf{P}(h_m \geq mC) \\ \leq\ & \sum_{i \leq n} \sum_x \mathbf{P}\left(h(X_i) \geq nC, \tau_k = i, X_i = x, h_{m+n-i}^i(x) \geq mC\right) \\ =\ & \sum_{i \leq n} \mathbf{P}\left(\bigcup_x \left\{h(X_i) \geq nC, \tau_k = i, X_i = x, h_{m+n-i}^i(x) \geq mC\right\}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Note that for each x and i,

$$\left\{h(X_i) \geq nC, \tau_k = i, X_i = x, h_{m+n-i}^i(x) \geq mC\right\}$$

implies that the walks move to x at time i with $h(x) \geq nC$. After that, the walk continues to move inside $\{v \in \mathbf{T} : h(v) > h(x)\}$ from x to some y at time $n+m-i$ with $h(y) - h(x) \geq mC$, and after time $n+m-i$, the walk does not come back to level $h(y)$. Therefore, it implies that $\{h_{n+m} \geq (n+m)C\}$ occurs. In other words,

$$\left\{h(X_i) \geq nC, \tau_k = i, X_i = x, h_{m+n-i}^i(x) \geq mC\right\} \subset \{h_{n+m} \geq (n+m)C\}.$$

Therefore,

$$\bigcup_x \left\{h(X_i) \geq nC, \tau_k = i, X_i = x, h_{m+n-i}^i(x) \geq mC\right\} \subset \{h_{n+m} \geq (n+m)C\}. \tag{3.24}$$

Finally, by (3.23) and (3.24),

$$\mathbf{P}(h_n \geq nC)\mathbf{P}(h_m \geq mC) \leq n\mathbf{P}(h_{n+m} \geq (n+m)C). \tag{3.25}$$

Therefore, Lemma 3.4 follows from (3.25). □

By Lemma 3.4 and a standard subadditive argument (see (II.6) in Grimmett (1999)), we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *For* $c = 2$ *and any* $b \geq 2$*, there exists* $0 \leq \alpha \leq \infty$ *such that*

$$\lim \frac{-1}{n} \log \mathbf{P}(h_n \geq (T+\epsilon)n) = \alpha.$$

4 Proof of Theorem 1.

Note that for $\epsilon < 1 - T$, and for all large n,

$$(\frac{b}{b+1})^n \leq \mathbf{P}(h(X_{i+1}) > h(X_i) \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq n) \leq \mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq n(T+\epsilon)). \tag{4.1}$$

Therefore,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq n(T+\epsilon)) < \infty. \tag{4.2}$$

Note also that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq n(T+\epsilon)) \\ \leq\ & \mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq n(T+\epsilon), h_n(N,M) \geq n(T+\epsilon/2)) + \mathbf{P}(h(X_n) - h_n(N,M) \geq n\epsilon/2). \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

By Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3, for $\epsilon > 0$, we select N and M such that

$$\mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq n(T+\epsilon)) \leq \mathbf{P}(h_n(N,M) \geq n(T+\epsilon/2)) + C_1 \exp(-C_2 n). \tag{4.4}$$

For N and M in (4.4), we may require that $N \geq N_0$ and $M \geq M_0$ for N_0 and M_0 in Lemma 3.3. By (4.4) and Lemma 3.3, there exist $C_i = C_i(\epsilon, N, M)$ for $i = 3, 4$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq n(T+\epsilon)) \leq C_3 \exp(-C_4 n). \tag{4.5}$$

By (4.5), for $\epsilon > 0$,

$$0 < \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq n(T+\epsilon)). \tag{4.6}$$

It remains for us to show the existence of the limit in Theorem 1. For each n and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq n(T+\epsilon)) \leq \sum_{l\leq n} \mathbf{P}(\max_{t\leq n} h(X_t) = l \geq n(T+\epsilon)). \tag{4.7}$$

On $\max_{t\leq n} h(X_t) = l$, we may select $t_0 \leq n$ that is the smallest time such that $h(X_{t_0}) = l$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{l\leq n} \mathbf{P}(\max_{t\leq n} h(X_t) = l \geq n(T+\epsilon)) \\
= \; & \sum_{v\in\mathbf{T}} \sum_{t_0\leq n} \sum_{l\leq n} \mathbf{P}(\max_{t\leq n} h(X_t) = l \geq n(T+\epsilon), h(X_{t_0}) = l, X_{t_0} = v). \qquad (4.8)
\end{aligned}$$

As defined in section 3, let $\{X_n^{t_0}(v)\}$ be the linearly reinforced random walks starting from v at time t_0 in a subtree $\{w \in \mathbf{T} : h(w) \geq h(v)\}$. Since the walks are transient, the walks in $\{w \in \mathbf{T} : h(w) \geq h(v)\}$, starting from v at time t_0, will not return to v with a positive probability. We denote this event by $\mathcal{Q}(t_0, v)$ and this probability by $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{Q}(t_0, v)) = C > 0$. By (4.7) and (4.8), note that $\mathcal{Q}(t_0, v)$ and $\{\max_{t\leq t_0} h(X_t) = l \geq n(T+\epsilon), h(X_{t_0}) = l, X_{t_0} = v\}$ are independent, so

$$\begin{aligned}
& C\mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq n(T+\epsilon)) \\
= \; & \sum_{v\in\mathbf{T}} \sum_{t_0\leq n} \sum_{l\leq n} \mathbf{P}\left(\max_{t\leq n} h(X_t) = l \geq n(T+\epsilon), h(X_{t_0}) = l, X_{t_0} = v\right) \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{Q}(t_0, v)) \\
\leq \; & \sum_{v\in\mathbf{T}} \sum_{t_0\leq n} \sum_{l\leq n} \mathbf{P}\left(\max_{t\leq t_0} h(X_t) = l \geq n(T+\epsilon), h(X_{t_0}) = l, X_{t_0} = v, \mathcal{Q}(t_0, v)\right) \\
= \; & \sum_{t_0\leq n} \sum_{l\leq n} \mathbf{P}\left(\bigcup_{v\in\mathbf{T}} \left\{\max_{t\leq t_0} h(X_t) = l \geq n(T+\epsilon), h(X_{t_0}) = l, X_{t_0} = v, \mathcal{Q}(t_0, v)\right\}\right). \qquad (4.9)
\end{aligned}$$

If

$$\left\{\max_{t\leq t_0} h(X_t) = l \geq n(T+\epsilon), h(X_{t_0}) = l, X_{t_0} = v, \mathcal{Q}(t_0, v)\right\}$$

occurs, it implies that the walks move to v at $t_0 \leq n$ with $h(v) \geq n(T+\epsilon)$. After that, the walks continue to move inside $\{x \in \mathbf{T} : h(x) \geq h(v)\}$ from v and never return to v. This implies that t_0 is a cut time and X_{t_0} is a cut vertex with $h(X_{t_0}) \geq n(T+\epsilon)$. So for $t_0 \leq n$,

$$\left\{\max_{t\leq t_0} h(X_t) = l \geq n(T+\epsilon), h(X_{t_0}) = l, X_{t_0} = v, \mathcal{Q}(t_0, v)\right\} \subset \{h_{t_0} \geq n(T+\epsilon)\}.$$

Thus,

$$\bigcup_{v} \left\{\max_{t\leq n} h(X_t) = l \geq n(T+\epsilon), h(X_{t_0}) = l, X_{t_0} = v, \mathcal{Q}(t_0, v)\right\} \subset \{h_{t_0} \geq n(T+\epsilon)\}. \qquad (4.10)$$

Therefore, by (4.9) and (4.10),

$$\mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq n(T+\epsilon)) \leq C^{-1} n \sum_{t_0\leq n} \mathbf{P}(h_{t_0} \geq n(T+\epsilon)). \qquad (4.11)$$

For $t_0 < n$, we know that

$$h_{t_0} \leq h_n. \qquad (4.12)$$

So by (4.11) and (4.12),

$$\mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq n(T+\epsilon)) \leq C^{-1}n^2\mathbf{P}(h_n \geq n(T+\epsilon)). \tag{4.13}$$

On the other hand, we suppose that $h_n \geq n(T+\epsilon)$. Note that if $\tau_k \leq n \leq \tau_{k+1}$, then

$$h_n = h\left(X_{\tau_k}\right) \leq h(X_n). \tag{4.14}$$

By (4.14),

$$\mathbf{P}(h_n \geq n(T+\epsilon)) \leq \mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq n(T+\epsilon)). \tag{4.15}$$

Now we are ready to show Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. Together with (4.13), (4.15), and Lemma 3.4,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbf{P}(h(X_n) \geq n(T+\epsilon)) = \alpha. \tag{4.16}$$

By (4.2) and (4.6),

$$0 < \alpha < \infty. \tag{4.17}$$

Therefore, Theorem 1 follows from (4.16) and (4.17). □

5 Proof of Theorem 2.

Similarly, we define the same cut times τ_i that we defined for the linearly reinforced random walk. We have $\left(\tau_{k+1}-\tau_k, h(Y_{\tau_{k+1}})-h(Y_{\tau_k})\right)$ as an i.i.d. sequence. We can also follow Durrett, Kesten, and Limic's (2002) Lemmas 7 and 8 to show that there exist C_i for $i=1,2$ such that, for each k,

$$\mathbf{P}(\tau_{k+1}-\tau_k \geq m) \leq C_1 \exp(-C_2 m) \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}(h(Y_{\tau_{k+1}})-h(Y_{\tau_k}) \geq m) \leq C_1 \exp(-C_2 m). \tag{5.2}$$

By (5.1) and (5.2), similar to our approach the linearly reinforced random walk, we set

$$S_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} (\tau_k - \tau_{k-1}) \text{ and } K_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(h(Y_{\tau_k}) - h(Y_{\tau_{k-1}})\right). \tag{5.3}$$

By the law of large numbers,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{S_n}{n} = A \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{K_n}{n} = B. \tag{5.4}$$

With these observations, Theorem 2 can follow from the exact proof of Theorem 1. In fact, we may not need to truncate τ_i to $\tau_i(N,M)$ as we did for Theorem 1, since we can use (5.1) and (5.2) directly. □

6 Proof of Theorem 3.

Now we need to estimate $\mathbf{P}(h(Y_n) \le n(S-\epsilon))$. Let

$$L_n = \max\{i, \tau_i \le n\}$$

and let

$$h_n = \sum_{i=1}^{L_n} \left(h\left(Y_{\tau_i}\right) - h\left(Y_{\tau_{i-1}}\right)\right). \tag{6.1}$$

By (1.7), (5.3), and an argument similar to (3.6), we have

$$\frac{B}{A} = S. \tag{6.2}$$

Since $h_n \le h(Y_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}(h(Y_n) \le n(S-\epsilon B)) \\ \le\ & \mathbf{P}(h_n \le n(S-\epsilon B)) \\ \le\ & \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} \left(h\left(Y_{\tau_i}\right) - h\left(Y_{\tau_{i-1}}\right)\right) \le n(S-\epsilon B\right). \end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

We split

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} (h(Y_{\tau_i}) - h(Y_{\tau_{i-1}})) \le n(S-\epsilon B)\right) \\ \le\ & \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} (h(Y_{\tau_i}) - h(Y_{\tau_{i-1}})) \le n(S-\epsilon B), L_n \ge n(SB^{-1}-\epsilon/2)\right) \\ & +\mathbf{P}\left(L_n < n(SB^{-1}-\epsilon/2)\right) \\ =\ & I + II. \end{aligned}$$

We estimate I nd II separately:

$$\begin{aligned} I\ =\ & \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{L_n} (h(Y_{\tau_i}) - h(Y_{\tau_{i-1}})) \le n(S-\epsilon B), L_n \ge n(SB^{-1}-\epsilon/2)\right) \\ \le\ & \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n(SB^{-1}-\epsilon/2)} (h(Y_{\tau_i}) - h(Y_{\tau_{i-1}})) \le n(S-\epsilon B)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

Note that

$$\mathbf{E}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n(SB^{-1}-\epsilon/2)} (h(Y_{\tau_i}) - h(Y_{\tau_{i-1}}))\right) = n(S-\epsilon B/2). \tag{6.5}$$

Note also that by (5.2), $\{h(Y_{\tau_i}) - h(Y_{\tau_{i-1}})\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence with an exponential tail, so by Lemma 3.1 there exist $C_i = C_i(\epsilon, B)$ for $i = 3, 4$ such that

$$I \le C_3 \exp(-C_4 n). \tag{6.6}$$

Also, by (6.2),

$$II = \mathbf{P}\left(L_n < n(SB^{-1} - \epsilon/2)\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n(SB^{-1}-\epsilon/2)} (\tau_i - \tau_{i-1}) \ge n\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n(A^{-1}-\epsilon/2)} (\tau_i - \tau_{i-1}) \ge n\right).$$

Note that

$$\mathbf{E} \sum_{i=1}^{n(A^{-1}-\epsilon/2)} (\tau_i - \tau_{i-1}) = n(1 - \epsilon A/2). \tag{6.7}$$

Note also that by (5.1), $\{\tau_i - \tau_{i-1}\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence with an exponential tail, so by Lemma 3.1, there exist $C_i = C_i(\epsilon, B)$ for $i = 5, 6$ such that

$$II \le C_5 \exp(-C_6 n). \tag{6.8}$$

Together with (6.4), (6.6), and (6.8), there exist $C_i = C_i(c, \epsilon, B)$ for $i = 7, 8$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}(h(Y_n) \le n(S - \epsilon)) \le C_7 \exp(-C_8 n). \tag{6.9}$$

From (6.9),

$$0 < \liminf \frac{-1}{n} \log \mathbf{P}(h(Y_n) \le n(S - \epsilon)). \tag{6.10}$$

If the walks repeatedly move in the edge connecting the origin in n times, we have the probability $(\frac{2}{b+1})^n$. Thus, for $\epsilon < S$ and for all large n,

$$(\frac{2}{b+1})^n \le \mathbf{P}(h(Y_n) \le 1) \le \mathbf{P}(h(Y_n) \le n(S - \epsilon)). \tag{6.11}$$

So for $\epsilon < S$,

$$\limsup \frac{-1}{n} \log \mathbf{P}(h(Y_n) \le n(S - \epsilon)) < \infty. \tag{6.12}$$

Therefore, Theorem 3 follows from (6.10) and (6.12). □

References

1. Aidekon, E. (2008). Transient random walks in random environment on a Galton Watson tree. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **142**, 525–559.

2. Collevecchio, A. (2006). Limit theorems for reinforced random walks on certain trees. *Probab. Theory Relate Fields* **136**, 81–101.

3. Engle, E. (1997). *Sperner Theory.* Cambridge Univ. Press, New York.

4. Durrett, R., Kesten, H., and Limic, V. (2002). Once reinforced random walk. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **122**, 567–592.

5. Grimmett, G. (1999). *Percolation.* Springer-Verlag, New York.

6. Pemantle, R. (1988). Phase transition in reinforced random walks and RWRE on trees. *Ann. Probab.* **16**, 1229–1241.